

MA

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
A Delaware Limited Liability Partnership
500 Campus Drive
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932-1047
(973) 360-1100

FILED
AUG 31 2009
Judge Jamie D. Happe

Attorneys for Defendants
JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON & JOHNSON
PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.,
and ORTHO-McNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., now known as ORTHO-McNEIL-
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

GRACIE VASQUEZ and
CHARLES VASQUEZ, W/H,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ORTHO-McNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC., JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON
& JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.
f/k/a R.W. JOHNSON
PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, JANE DOE DISTRIBUTORS
(1-50), JILL DOE MANUFACTURERS (1-
50), JACK DOE WHOLESALERS (1-50),
JAKE DOE SELLERS (1-50), JOHN DOE
MARKETERS (1-50), JOAN DOE
FORMULATORS (1-50), JIM DOE
HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS (1-50), and
JEAN DOE (1-50),

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY
DOCKET NUMBER: MID-L-3433-08-MT

CIVIL ACTION

IN RE ORTHO EVRA® BIRTH CONTROL
PATCH LITIGATION
CASE CODE 275

SUMMARY JUDGMENT ORDER

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP,
attorneys for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical Research &
Development, LLC, and Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc., now known as Ortho-McNeil-
Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., on a motion for summary judgment pursuant to R. 4:46, the Court
having considered this application, and good cause having been shown;

It is on this ³¹~~28~~ day of August, 2009

ORDERED as follows:

1. Defendants' motion for summary judgment be and hereby is GRANTED;
2. Plaintiffs' Complaint be and hereby is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; and
3. A copy of this Order shall be served upon all counsel of record within 7 days from the date of entry.


Hon. Jamie D. Haggas, J.S.C.

This motion was:

 Opposed
X Unopposed

**On this date, pursuant to R.1:6-2
the court's statement of reasons
have been set forth on the record.**

Having reviewed the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R.1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.